

PARLI Debate

Wilcox, David (*14)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 401
Gov: 5 Chen - Jones
Opp: 13 Tang - Blais
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Wilcox David
Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

Team Code #: PROP 5
Prop Speaker #1 Jones pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Chen pts 27

Team Code #: OPP 13
Opp Speaker #1 TANG pts 25
Opp Speaker #2 Blais pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: well spoken referred to notes a lot, good use of evidence good use of hand + body gestures caught opp at saying "ing sense won"
Prop 2: caught + tang at saying "war can be won". Stop saying "time starts now" - wasted effort. comes up from looking at paper jerkily

refers to notes too often speech
Opp 1: should be a bit slower some good pts about negative impact of war but this is ruined by admitting several times war can be won. "All the jews died under Hitler" - yiker
Opp 2: Rambling on definition, referring too much to notes. ended abruptly. Stopped prop from asking question twice said "sorry" to team & loudly upon sitting down admitting poor job - not good

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the Prop (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: TANG lost this by agreeing on multiple occasions that war "kinda won" in a sense won" and her partner did not refute this so it just is over as a debate.

Prop 2

Clear speech but rambling
good refute - no peace treaty with nazis is
wrong

PARLI Debate

Wilcox, David (*14)

Round 2B 11:15am Room 401
Gov: 11 Sadana - Wagh
Opp: 24 Corbett - Somerday
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Wilcox, David
Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

Team Code #: PROP 11

Team Code #: OPP 24

Prop Speaker #1 Sadana pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Corbett pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Wagh pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Somerday pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: poor eye contact. says too often. oxford study at 5 hours per day video usage seems high usage to prove gaming causes violent behaviour. speech clear

Prop 2: clicking pen distracting read notes too much. video games addictive does not prove violence caused but them

Opp 1: good eye contact and body language. good point no correlation between areas of high violent behaviour in those areas. this point was not refuted and cause victory

Opp 2: refuted direct link sandy hook good point city study with no link - excellent NRA point not refuted drove home pts of partner, good followup

TEAM CODE #: 11 on the Opp wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: Prop did not prove their point relied too heavily on sandy hook just one case of violence. opp played on other factors influencing violent behaviour and drove home that no direct link between areas of high violent game usage and high violence.

PARLI Debate

Condello, Dave (*1)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 425
Gov: 5 Cuddihy - Goldblatt
Opp: 14 Tran - Vainberg
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Dave Condello

Judge's School Affiliation: AWAY

Team Code #: PROP 5

Team Code #: OPP 14

Prop Speaker #1 GOLDBLATT pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 TRAN pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 CUDDIHY pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 VAINBERG pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair

24-20 = Poor

<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: + PASSION

+ GOOD - EYE CONTACT
Final Points
+ 280
SPEECH
EYE CONTACT

Prop 1: + GOOD JOB DEFINING DEBATE TERMS
+ GOOD POSTURE + VOLUME
- MINOR POINT - LOST COUNT OF POINTS

+ NICE JOB OF RE-STATING AND CLARIFYING
Opp 1: DEBATE
- SLIGHT CONFUSION OF WWI + WWII
+ NICE PASSION + VOLUME + NATURAL GESTURES
- "BENEFICIAL" WASN'T REFERRING TO DEATHS BUT RATHER OUTCOME OF WAR

- SHORT (4 min)
+ NICE RE-STATING OF DEFINITIONS
Prop 2:
+ GREAT VOLUME + TONE
- SOME STUMBLES VERBALLY
+ POISED ANSWER TO OPP QUESTION
- ABRUPT END / CONCLUSION

+ CLEAR SPEECH + GREAT TONE
Opp 2: + GREAT EYE CONTACT
- SLOW DOWN, PLENTY OF TIME
+ REVISITED CONTENTIONS WELL
+ PASSION

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the PROP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP TEAM WAS THE BETTER TEAM IN TERMS OF TONE AND PRESENTATION BUT THE PROP TEAM PRESENTED THE MORE COMPELLING ARGUMENT. NICE JOB BY BOTH TEAMS!

LEFT
COW
PLATE
ON
PODIUM
RETURNED
TO
GUT
IT

PARLI Debate

Condello, Dave (*1)

Round 2B 11:15am Room 425

Gov: 7 Giang - Shen

Opp: 13 Sinha - Almeida

Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name:

Dave Condello

Judge's School Affiliation:

ANALY

Team Code #: PROP 7

Team Code #: OPP 13

Prop Speaker #1 GIANG pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 SINHA pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 SHEN pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 ALMEIDA pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair

24-20 = Poor

<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

<p>- RELAX! YOU KNOW THIS STUFF. SLOW DOWN A BIT + LET IT FLOW</p>	<p>+ ESTABLISHED TERMS WELL Prop 1: - NEED BETTER BALANCE OF EYE CONTACT AND NOTE READING + GOOD USE OF REFERENCES - WORK ON SMOOTHER DELIVERY + HAS GOOD TONES, PRACTICES WILL BRING SUCCESS</p>	<p>→ FACTS + GOOD WORK CONTRASTING DEFINITIONS Opp 1: + USE OPPOSING REFERENCES TO REFUTE PROP ARGUMENT + GOOD TONE, VOLUME, AND EYE CONTACT - DIDN'T ANSWER PROP QUESTION + NICE JOB OF REMINDING US OF "FACT DEBATE"</p>
<p>+ NICE QUESTION! - MINOR LAPSE IN FOCUS BUT GOOD RECOVERY</p>	<p>Prop 2: + GOOD TONES + VOLUME - EYE CONTACT + REPEATED REFERENCES TO SUPPORT PROP ARGUMENT + PASSION</p>	<p>Opp 2: + TONE + VOLUME - EYE CONTACT (IMPROVED OVER TIME) + GOOD JOB OF ADDRESSING PROP ARGUMENTS - CITING STUDIES TO SUPPORT ARGUMENTS WOULD BE HELPFUL</p>

TEAM CODE #: 13 on the OPP (Prop or Opp) wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: TOUGH TOPIC FOR PROP TEAM!

SCOPE OF PROP ARGUMENT WORKED AGAINST THEM.
(I.E. - "ALL VIOLENCE" VS "SOME" VIOLENCE.) OPP TEAM
USED FACTS TO BETTER ADVANTAGE. BOTH TEAMS
HAVE GREAT POTENTIAL.

PARLI Debate

Herman, Roy (*13)

Round 2A 11:15am Room 426

Gov: 14 Wu - Ying

Opp: 3 Burgmann - McCann-Phillips

Parliamentary Debate/JV

A-Flight only

Judge's Name: Roy Herman

Judge's School Affiliation: Livermore

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 3

Prop Speaker #1 Ying pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 McCann-Phillips pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Wu pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Burgmann pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence...
Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Great opening speaks
FACT DEBATE NEED A LOT OF FACTS
LIKED THE DEBATE AS WAR ANALOGY,
GIVE MORE DETAIL
YOU HAD TIME

Opp 1: GREAT SPEAKS OVERALL.
GOOD TOPICALITY CHECK. YOUR
COMMON USE DEFINITION DID FIT
UNDER THEIR DEFINITION

Prop 2: GREAT POINTS
WORK ON SMOOTHER PRESENTATION
LIKED THE FIGHTING DISEASE
AND DEPRESSION. WHERE DID
THE WAR ON TERROR OR DRUGS GO?

Opp 2: GOOD SPEAKS. REALLY LIKED
THE WAR NEVER REALLY ENDS
DISCUSSION, LEADS TO MORE SERIOUS
EFFECTS AND ECONOMIC TURMOIL COMMENTS

TEAM CODE #: 3 on the NEW wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

FACT DEBATES ARE BORING AND NEED A PLETHORA OF FACTS. THE
TOPICALITY CHECK DIDN'T REALLY WORK BECAUSE THE NEW DEFINITION
WAS SQUARELY INSIDE THE AFF DEFINITION. THIS TURNED ON THE
WELL POSITIONED IDEA WAR BEGETS WAR.

PARLI Debate

Liu, Hongche (*11)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 404
Gov: 24 Woerner - Miner
Opp: 20 Rahman - Zhou
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Hongche Liu

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High

PROP
Team Code #: 24

OPP
Team Code #: 20

Prop Speaker #1 Woerner pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Rahman pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Miner pts 25

Opp Speaker #2 Zhou pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:

War can be won "by one side" can be too narrow and it induces objection. Be prepared to adapt.

Prop 2: You ~~need to~~ ^{can disagree} with opp's modification. Then it is left to judge to choose which is fair.

You could still win by providing one case where the net benefits > 0.

TEAM CODE #: 20 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

disagreement on definition. Prop "War can be won by one side", Opp: "War can be won by humanity". The arguments all bypass each other's. In the end, Opp definition is more fair.

Opp 1: The argument on even "war can be won by humanity" is weak. Surely, there are lives lost, money spent. But there is no weighing. You could easily be refuted.

Opp 2:

PARLI Debate

Liu, Hongche (*11)

Round 2B 11:15am Room 404

Gov: 7 Gan - Mathew

Opp: 4 Jayasuriya - Schulz

Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Hongche Liu

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High

PROP
Team Code #: 7

OPP
Team Code #: 4

Prop Speaker #1 Mathew pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Schulz pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Gan pts 26

Opp Speaker #2 Jayasuriya pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: .
 contentions are more conjectures than arguments. "Women as sexual objects" is hardly relevant. As DPP pointed out, I agree that the evidence is weak.

Prop 2:
 Your key evidence on "Journal of Medical Resources" alluded me. You spoke too fast on the most important piece of information.

Opp 1: You can but you don't have to bring up mental health as the cause. It is opening for attack. Citing "96% no correlation by NYT" was the winner. On the other hand, your PROP could say the 4% does lead to violent behavior.

Opp 2:
 too many analogies on the point of lack of solid evidence. However, you did cover all the refutations.

TEAM CODE #: 4 on the Opp wins this debate.
 (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Stronger arguments and evidence on the DPP side.

PARLI Debate

^A
Sharma, Kashyp (*7)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 406
Gov: 27 Manni - Brown
Opp: 4 Johnson - Pashman
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: KASHYAP SHARMA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS, San Ramon

Team Code #: PROP 27

Team Code #: OPP 4

Prop Speaker #1 Manni pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Johnson pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Brown pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Pashman pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Analyzed, provided Evidence
POI, courteous, good part

Opp 1: No need of providing excuses
not ready of what Prop is
preparing, But Very good
in argument, delivery, good part
like Finance Burden

Prop 2: Can improve presentation
of delivery can be improved

Opp 2: Improve posture, stand straight
Great in Argument, good in delivery
can improve eye contact

TEAM CODE #: 27 on the ~~Prop~~ wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Prop

PARLI Debate

Sharma, Kashyap^A (*7)

Round 2B 11:15am Room 406
Gov: 24 Bodisco - Ransweiler
Opp: 5 Reyna - Yang
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: KASHYAP SHARMA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS, San Ramon

Team Code #: PROP 24

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 Ransweiler pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 Reyna pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Bodisco pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Yang pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Courteous, clear
but provided very less
information as Speaker #1
- finished in 2 min,

Opp 1: Clear, Loud, having fact,
Able to rebuttal on points
- Should be courteous

Prop 2: Clear, having factual
information,
- But Restated
- finished in 2 min

Opp 2: Clear, Argumentative

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the opp wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Able to rebuttal on each points (main point) (Argumentation)
- Delivery
- Analysis
- Evidence of environment/Social

PARLI Debate

Deng, Bo-Liang (*23)

Round 2A 11:15am Room 423
Gov: 24 Crenshaw - Bulger
Opp: 11 Pandit - Maddhuri
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Bo-Liang Deng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Academy

PROP
Team Code #: 24

OPP
Team Code #: 11

Prop Speaker #1 Bulger pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 ~~Bulger~~ Pandit pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Crenshaw pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Maddhuri pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: *showed respect to others effective answered the questions.*

Opp 1: *the speak is well organized, and respond to the points made by the other side - easy to follow and understand*

Prop 2: *reasonable and effective analysed the topic effective responde to the questions.*

Opp 2: *provided answer to the points made by another side ~~direct and effective answered~~*

TEAM CODE #: 11 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

well organized and very delivered the message

PARLI Debate

Deng, Bo-Liang (*23)

Round 2B 11:15am Room 423

Gov: 11 Dara - Randeria

Opp: 24 Campagna - Mortensen

Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Bo-Liang Deng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Academy

Team Code #: PROP 11

Team Code #: OPP 24

Prop Speaker #1 Shanay Randeria pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Campagna pts 26

Prop Speaker #2 Rohith Dara pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Mortensen pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair

24-20 = Poor

<20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: ~~well~~ well organized the speech and showed evidence related to the topics reasonable analyzed the topic.

Opp 1: ~~effective~~ effective respond to the arguments and provides their rational well organized and delivered

Prop 2: ~~effective~~ effective respond to the arguments and direct delivered the points provided strong support the arguments.

Opp 2: ~~provides~~ provides facts to support the key points and delivered the message very well.

TEAM CODE #: 11 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

more reasonable analyzed the topic and more direct and effective resp responded the questions.

PARLI Debate

Hulett, Paul (*27)

Round 2A 11:15am Room 408
Gov: 22 Masters - Fehring **APF**
Opp: 7 Tripathi - Wong **NEG**
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: HULETT

Judge's School Affiliation: WINDSOR

Team Code #: PROP 22

Team Code #: OPP 7

Prop Speaker #1 Fehring pts 27

Opp Speaker #1 Tripathi pts 26

Prop Speaker #2 Masters pts 25

Opp Speaker #2 Wong pts 24

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Great delivery. Excellent job setting the definition up to be accepted by the neg. Your calm assurance that your definition had been established and proven worked well for you.

Prop 2: Good job reinforcing the direction of the debate and defining the conditions for finding that something has been one.

Opp 1: Great delivery. You need to work on convincing the judge to look at the topic from your point of view. If you could have moved to "armed conflict" and defined "win" from a broader perspective you may have been able to put AFF on the defensive.

Opp 2: Try not to read from your notes (more eye contact). Try to find a speaking rhythm that you can maintain. Your passion came through, keep it up!

TEAM CODE #: 22 on the APF wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Skillful definition of the topic moved the debate into proving that winning and losing are real things and away from the messy parts of justifying the costs of war.

PARLI Debate

Aulett, Paul (*27)

Round 2B 11:15am Room 408
Gov: 22 Katewa - Colenbrander
Opp: 7 Zhang - Yang
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: HULETT

Judge's School Affiliation: WINDSOR

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: <u>22</u>		Team Code #: <u>7</u>	
Prop Speaker #1 <u>Katewa</u> pts <u>26</u>		Opp Speaker #1 <u>Yang</u> pts <u>26</u>	
Prop Speaker #2 <u>Colenbrander</u> pts <u>25</u>		Opp Speaker #2 <u>Zhang</u> pts <u>24</u>	

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Excellent job defining the topic and framing the debate. Your impassioned delivery and personal examples created great momentum for your argument. Be careful of restating the same facts over and over.

Prop 2: Great job challenging the exception of the mentally ill. You did a great turnaround on the "games as therapy" argument and convinced me that was also violent behavior.

Opp 1: Please work on the courtesy you show. The loud sighs, perfunctory "thanks for being here" and the way you dismissed questions all worked against you. You did a good job dismissing most of their arguments, but when you didn't challenge the "verbal abuse" part of their argument, it put you very far behind.

Opp 2: Great delivery, but your argument against the definition came too late, as I felt that the second aff speaker's points should not be taken off the board so late.

TEAM CODE #: 22 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Whitmore, Robin (Lowell #14)

Mackinnon, Jesse (*4)

Round 2A 11:15am Room 407
Gov: 13 Banas- Santos
Opp: 24 Barton - Madsen
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Robin Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP
Team Code #: 13

OPP
Team Code #: 24

Prop Speaker #1 Banas pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 Barton pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Santos pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Madsen pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: (29)

Very good job at rebuttal - used all points clearly.
Careful with "uhm"s

Prop 2: (28)

great job listing points, but I think there was some confusion around Net Benefits

TEAM CODE #: 13

on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

Opp 1: (27) - also, try to stop adjusting your tie 😊

Good job, but too focused on loss of life as a rebuttal for all points. Try to avoid using "absolutes" like "always" "never" "everyone" they're too easy to rebut!

(27) Good job, but I sensed you were losing your points. ~~Also~~ Need to appear more focused.

REASON FOR DECISION:

More focused on points from their side and also in their rebuttal of the other side

Whitmore, Robin (Lowell #14)

PARLI Debate

~~Mackinnon, Jesse (*4)~~

Round 2B 11:15am Room 407
Gov: 17 Desai - Khare
Opp: 27 Ramirez - Castenada
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Robin Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

Team Code #: **PROP** 17

Team Code #: **OPP** 27

Prop Speaker #1 Khare pts 26

Opp Speaker #1 Castenada pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Desai pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Ramirez pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:

Good job, but it seemed like you were reading much of it, and repeating.

Need to use all of your time and expand on your points more

Prop 2:

→ Great speaking! Very clear points, especially in refuting the opp.

TEAM CODE #: 27

on the Opp wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

Opp 1:

very clear statement of points, but try to not use so many "like"s and "yeah"s. 😊

Not sure that the illegality of minors & video games helped

Opp 2: Your point. Why is this the law?

→ Great response to POI and very clear and strong points. Try not to repeat your teammate though—use your own words

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop team did not have real evidence/facts showing correlation. Opp team did a great job of pointing this out.

PARLI Debate

Kovitz, Bo (*3)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 409
Gov: 14 Eng - Morgenstein
Opp: 5 Firsov - Kwak
Parliamentary Debate/JV

"WAR
CAN
BE WON"

Judge's Name: BO KOVITZ

Judge's School Affiliation: BERKELEY HS.

Team Code #: PROP 14

Team Code #: OPP 5

Prop Speaker #1 MORGENSTEIN pts 25

Opp Speaker #1 KWAK pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 ENG pts 24

Opp Speaker #2 FIRSOV pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

war is a state of armed conflict

Prop 1: GOOD FLUENCY. Clever contentions. Perhaps too clever? They weren't exactly arguments, however. Also, you kind of misunderstood what their kritik was and what the purpose was. Also, don't wear sneakers.

Prop 2: Why is it a fair resolution? you can't necessarily argue that war can't be won (there are declared winners/losers). good speaking style.

Opp 1: Pretty good kritik for JV. I'm glad you had a response to the AFF's framing of the round. Solid speaking. Though I would work on talking slower/not slipping over your words. I think you could just run TOPICALITY to refute their case construction and then run your k.

Opp 2: WORK A LITTLE MORE ON ORGANIZATION. Nice explanations/examples, created tangible points. I think you could have left some points to your partner to save time/respond to their case.

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the OPP wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: NEG was RIGHT. AFF framed the debate way too unfairly. Let this be a lesson to be as specific as possible in defining a vague topic. Also, you would have avoided the whole definitions/framework debate that chewed up 75% of the debate. I wish I could have seen more substantive clash over the issues. Neg kritik was ok, but work on organization and improving logical steps of each point.

I guess to make this applicable to lay judges, argue that wars can't be "won" because the losses are so morally reprehensible that winners "lose" by being the victors of a corrupt/heinous practice.

* Really think AFF should have picked a WAR. Like war on drugs. War against Iraq. The more specific, the better. Your defining of the res is pretty abusive.

VIOLENT VIDEO GAMES LEAD TO VIOLENT BEHAVIOR

PARLI Debate

"caused" "mitakes"

Kovitz, Bo (*3)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 409
Gov: 7 Su - Her
Opp: 24 Fulop - Bennett
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: BO KOVITZ

Judge's School Affiliation: BERKELEY H.S.

Team Code #: PROP 7 OPP 24
Prop Speaker #1 SU pts 25 Opp Speaker #1 FULOP pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 HER pts 25 Opp Speaker #2 BENNETT pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:
30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- Analysis: How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
Evidence: How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence...
Argumentation: How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
Points of Information: How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
Delivery: How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
Courtesy: How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Your "contentions" aren't contentions. You can't "contend" "hard facts." Instead, each contention has to be an argument, claim on its own. Like "violent video games are more likely to have violent thoughts than violent actions lead to violent behavior." Also SLOW DOWN. You talk too fast.

Opp 1: Excellent refutation / speaking style! I think you could have linked in your thoughts on intervening variables to criticize their studies (you kinda did it for their 2nd contention) you can also talk about how violent video games teach strategy, help the player understand realities of war/understand the harms/therefore be deterred.

Prop 2: SLOW DOWN. You need to show causal links and that requires talking methodology / statistical analysis. You misunderstood NEG's argument about how the research on violent video games are catered to mature groups

Opp 2: Very great point about the violent shooters. Think you needed to explain better why your point about "Rated R/M games shouldn't be given to 10 year olds" relates to why their study doesn't matter in the resolution. Not letting kids play - how does that relate to your points? Remember what your goals are, link everything back to your case. Otherwise, solid. Just work on confidence / speaking style / fluidity and speaking w/o being too attached to your notes.

TEAM CODE #: 24 on the OPP wins this debate. (Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Voted for OPP because they argued better and debunked some assumptions made by Aff and showed that Aff didn't prove CAUSALITY. Intervening factors was a HUGE POINT FOR NEG.

children are adolescents by the way! Aff - you can't just provide "facts" studies are studies/statistics and unless you explain methods they're less likely to trust your evidence. Statistical significance

Calm down. Be less aggressive. Pretty good explanation of video games + muscle memory

Neg also could use some studies on your side w/ intervening factors. Still won b/c you debunked. Remember, they're arguing for a ban. They're trying to show causality.

good job catching them on causal fallacy. Remember what your goals are, link everything back to your case. Otherwise, solid. Just work on confidence / speaking style / fluidity and speaking w/o being too attached to your notes.

PARLI Debate

Galvan, Ernest (*2)
Round 2A 11:15am Room 405
Gov: 17 Chou - Kim
Opp: 5 Visht - Koshkin
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: William Byrne
Judge's School Affiliation: Pine Valley

Team Code #: PROP 17 Team Code #: OPP 5
Prop Speaker #1 Chou pts 27 Opp Speaker #1 Visht pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Kim pts 27 Opp Speaker #2 Koshkin pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: You are a very solid speaker, but you may need to do a better job of identifying and backing up the one or two key points in your current debate as the use of the term "justice" was clearly the hot topic and not enough time was spent defending your stance on it.

Opp 1: You have excellent control of your speech while speaking which makes you a very powerful first speaker. I suspect that you have some policy debate experience, and if you don't, then you should try it out.

Prop 2: use of the term "justice" was clearly the hot topic and not enough time was spent defending your stance on it.

Opp 2: You do a very good job of controlling the second speech with your slower speech, but you may want to work out some of the debate day jitters as you do tend to stumble over your words at times.

Applies to both speakers.

TEAM CODE #: 5 on the Opp wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Honestly this was a very tough round to judge, but the use and defining of "justice" was the clincher as it added to the Opp's ability to make this into a metaphorical debate, thus pulling in a strong win for the Opp.

PARLI Debate

Galvan, Ernest (*2)
Round 2B 11:15am Room 405
Gov: 27 Lavell - Hall
Opp: 14 Liu - Fu
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: William Byrne
Judge's School Affiliation: Pine Valley

Team Code #: PROP 27
Prop Speaker #1 Hall pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Lavell pts 26

Team Code #: OPP 14
Opp Speaker #1 Liu pts 26
Opp Speaker #2 Fu pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: You have a good grasp on the contents of your speeches, but try speaking with more confidence. Also, try to whisper quieter during opposing speeches.

Prop 2: You make good points in your second speech, but the examples that you give tend to derail said speech at times.

Opp 1: You do a very good job of attacking your opponent's case when it comes to making a main point, but your subsequent examples in support of said points reach a hyperbole that tends to make light of your arguments. Changing things such as "billions" to "thousands" can make you sound much more credible.

Opp 2: [Handwritten note continues from Opp 1]

Applies to both speakers.

TEAM CODE #: 27 on the Prop wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Both teams made errors in their examples, but both teams also ran with said errors. The key factor here was real world impact and the Prop just had a stronger case in that regard. *Note: Both teams should use more of their speech time.

PARLI Debate

Sutton, Emma (*12)

Round 2A 11:15am Room 424
Gov: 5 Yuan - Stankus
Opp: 14 Shin - Shevelev
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Emma Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett HS

Team Code #: PROP 5-

Team Code #: OPP 14-

Prop Speaker #1 Stankus pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Shevelev pts 28

Prop Speaker #2 Yuan pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Shin pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: well organized speech, easy to follow and understand.

Opp 1: Great speaking style. Good job catching their contradiction (Claim they only need to prove 1 war, but that is above to demand we look at context).

Prop 2: Great questions, Good speech but dropped ~~at~~ too much.

Opp 2: Very passionate, but your logic was hard to follow

TEAM CODE #: ~~5-~~ 14 on the Opp wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Good clash, great rebuttation all around. In the end, opp convinced me that we must look at broader context. Not reasonable to claim that if one war was ever won in all history, Prop wins - impossible standard

PARLI Debate

Sutton, Emma (*12)

Round 2B 11:15am Room 424
Gov: 26 Arroyo - Stephens
Opp: 22 Baetkey - Blanchard
Parliamentary Debate/JV

Judge's Name: Emma Sutton

Judge's School Affiliation: John South HS

Team Code #: PROP 26

Team Code #: OPP 22

Prop Speaker #1 Stephens pts 28

Opp Speaker #1 Blanchard pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Arroyo pts 27

Opp Speaker #2 Baetkey pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

*Prop team
There is
no prop
time. Y.P.
was on the
edge of what
is acceptable*

Prop 1: Very well organized, and you showed impact of your contentions. Need to smooth out delivery, it's a bit choppy

Prop 2: Work on organizing - you jumped around a lot which made you hard to follow.

Opp 1: Good ~~del~~ delivery. At end of speech, summarize briefly and ask for my vote. Also, contentions need impact.

Opp 2: Very well organized, good delivery. Arguments lack links & impact

TEAM CODE #: 26 on the Prop. wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Good round, lots of clash! Prop was able to show ~~hard~~ hard impact. Opp arguments were somewhat off topic & Prop was able to bring debate back to their original contentions.